ARIZONA STATE VETERINARY MEDICAL EXAMINING BOARD

9535 E. DOUBLETREE RANCH ROAD, SUITE 100, SCOTTSDALE, AZ/85258/F/) PHONE (602) 364-1 PET (1738) FAX (602) 364-1039 VETBOARD.AZ.GOV

DEC 1 5 2017

RY

18-4it

COMPLAINT INVESTIGATION FORM

If there is an issue with more than one veterinarian please file a separate Complaint Investigation Form for each veteringrian

PLEASE PRINT OR TYPE

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

15 2017

	Date Received: 160, 19, 2017 Case Number: 10 97	
Α.	THIS COMPLAINT IS FILED AGAINST THE FOLLOWING: 16564; Name of Veterinarian/CVT: Kristine Heitman & Sheri Beck to Premise Name: Daotillo Aninul Cliniz tlettesout	3597
	Premise Name:	
В.	INFORMATION REGARDING THE INDIVIDUAL FILING COMPLAINT*: Name:	
	City: State: Zip Code: Home Telephone: Cell Telephone	Ē

^{*}STATE LAW REQUIRES WE HAVE TO DISCLOSE YOUR NAME UNLESS WE CAN SHOW THAT DISCLOSURE WILL RESULT IN SUBSTANTIAL HARM TO YOU, SOMEONE ELSE OR THE PUBLIC PER A.R.S. § 41-1010. IF YOU HAVE REASON TO BELIEVE THAT SUBSTANTIAL HARM WILL RESULT IN DISCLOSURE OF YOUR NAME PLEASE PROVIDE COPIES OF RESTRAINING ORDERS OR OTHER DOCUMENTATION.

C	C. PATIENT	INFORMAT	ilON (1):			
		Budo				
	Breed/S	pecies:	Cockapoo	Dog		
	Age:	12	Sex:	emili	Color:	Block
	PATIENT	INFORMATI	ON (2):			
	Name:_					
	Breed/Sp	pecies:				
	Age:		Sex:	·	Color:	
D.	VETERINA Please p	RIANS WHO	name, address	D CARE TO and phone	THIS PET FOR a number for a	THIS ISSUE: each veterinarian.
		Ocotille 3333	name, address of Blek i Blek janimal (s. Anizara A	llinic f	let Resor	t
		Ohard	er, Az 852.	84		
E.	direct kno	ovide the rowledge re	/-	e		ach witness that has
	A	ttestatio:	n of Person R	Requesti	ng Investiç	gation
anc any	d accurate / and all estigation	e to the be medical i of this cas	est of my know records or info se.	ledge. Fu	rther, I autho	ined herein is true orize the release of to complete the
	Signatur	e: M	N Dun			
	Date:	12/10	107			

t.,

F. ALLEGATIONS and/or CONCERNS:

Please provide all information that you feel is relevant to the complaint. This portion must be either typewritten or clearly printed in ink.

Please see attached roles for legibilty.

Complaint Dr Sheri Beck and Dr Kristine Heitman Arizona Statutes

13-2202

13-3806

13-3713

44-4211

I have been taking my dogs to Ocotillo Animal clinic since 2005 for both my cockapoo dogs.

In December 2016, Buddy was having urinary problems, so we went in and saw Dr. Sheri Beck for incontinence.

A myriad of tests were done, and it was determined she had no major illness. Due to her being spayed and an older dog, was the reason she was incontinent. A prescription was ordered, and Buddy began talking hormones and she improved and all was good.

Then, in late September- early October she began having the same issue. I called to have her prescription refilled. The receptionist I spoke to said she'd call it in. She said they saw her 10 months prior and didn't see any issue. Yet, Dr. Beck required another office visit.

I was unable to get time off work to do this and asked if I could just get the prescription filled because Buddy was very uncomfortable. Dr. Beck refused unless I would come in again and they could do more tests.

I was furious. I didn't have the time nor money to waste on more tests since this was already done. Yet she refused. I called a couple weeks later because Buddy was very depressed because of her leaking. This time the receptionist again didn't see any issue but a Dr. Heitman refused this time.

I told them, I understand they needed to fill an office visit quota, but my dog's health was on the line and all they could think about was greed.

They have been seeing my dogs since they were born, and I was in a month prior for my other dog Destiny. They just bilk customers out of their money and care nothing of the welfare of animals by refusing them the medications they need by extorting owners.

I don't know which statute this falls under so I noted several at the beginning of this letter that I feel may apply. These doctors are unethical and greedy, and their unsympathetic careless greed should not be permitted.

Thank you. Maria Drummond

Also ethical violations by Principles of Veterinary
Melical Enrich of AVMA

Lying to me that it is
a law I bring my dog in for well visit.

Eggor they can write a prescription



3333 S. Arizona Ave Chandler, AZ 85286 480-899-8181

To Whom It May Concern:

On December 11, 2017, a refill request was placed at Ocotillo Animal Clinic and Pet Resort by Maria Drummond under Buddy, 12yr old female spayed Cockapoo, for the medication Diethylstilbestrol (DES), through Medmetrics Compounding Pharmacy. I declined the request because the patient (Buddy Drummond) was due for an annual exam, as per Ocotillo Animal Clinic and Pet Resort policy.

I did not have any interaction with Maria Drummond or with Buddy. Please refer to the history of events listed in the medical history under phone calls, where Maria Drummond requested her records to be sent to Gilbert Animal Hospital on November 15, 2017. In addition on November 21, 2017 the receptionist, Michelle Vittal, spoke with Tristan from Medmetrics Compounding Pharmacy, notifying him that Maria Drummond was no longer our client.

Sincerely,

Kristine Heitman, DVM



VICTORIA WHITMORE - EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR -

ARIZONA STATE VETERINARY MEDICAL EXAMINING BOARD

1740 W. Adams Street, Ste. 4600, Phoenix, Arizona 85007 Phone (602) 364-1-PET (1738) • FAX (602) 364-1039 VETBOARD.AZ.GOV

INVESTIGATIVE COMMITTEE REPORT

TO: Arizona State Veterinary Medical Examining Board

FROM: PM Investigative Committee: Donald Noah, D.V.M. - Chair

Amrit Rai, D.V.M. - Absent

Adam Almaraz

Christine Butkiewicz, D.V.M. Tamara Murphy - **Absent**

STAFF PRESENT: Tracy Riendeau, CVT, Staff Investigator

Sunita Krishna, Assistant Attorney General

RE: Case: 18-44

Complainant(s): Maria Drummond

Respondent(s): Kristine Heitman, DVM (License: 6564)

SUMMARY:

Complaint Received at Board Office: 12/15/17

Committee Discussion: 3/6/18

Board IIR: 4/18/18

APPLICABLE STATUTES AND RULES:

Laws as Amended July 2014

(Salmon); Rules as Revised September

2013 (Yellow)

Complainant called Respondent to get a medication refill for "Buddy," a 12-year-old female Cockapoo. Respondent declined until the dog could be examined.

Complainant contends Respondent's conduct was unprofessional.

Complainant was noticed and did not appear.
Respondent was noticed and appeared.

The Committee reviewed medical records, testimony, and other documentation as described below:

- Complainant(s) narrative: Maria Drummond
- Respondent(s) narrative/medical record: Kristine Heitman, DVM

PROPOSED 'FINDINGS of FACT':

- 1. On December 14, 2016, the dog was presented to Dr. Beck for urinary incontinence for over 4 months. The dog was examined and blood work and a urinalysis was performed.
- 2. The following day, Dr. Beck relayed the lab results to Complainant. She recommended considering additional diagnostics for the increased globulin. Dr. Beck also discussed putting the dog back on Proin along with DES since Proin alone did not control symptoms. Complainant declined at that time due to conducting research on the internet and wanting to try a natural approach.
- 3. On January 5, 2017, Complainant called to have the recommended medications for urinary incontinence filled. Dr. Beck prescribed DES 1mg, 30 tablets 1 tablet once a day for 3 5 days, then 1 tablet once a week as needed through a compounding pharmacy and PPA 25mg, 60 tablets, 1 tablet every 12 hours was dispensed from the premise.
- 4. On November 13, 2017, Complainant called to request a refill of DES.
- 5. On November 15, 2017, Complainant was advised that the dog was due for her yearly exam therefore the prescription was declined. Staff offered to see if Dr. Beck would give Complainant a few days' worth of DES until the dog could be examined. Complainant was upset and requested that her medical records be transferred to another premise.
- 6. Complainant attempted to get the medication refilled through the compounding pharmacy which was declined on November 16th and 21st.
- 7. On December 11, 2017, Complainant again attempted to get the medication refilled through the compounding pharmacy. This time, Dr. Beck's associate, Dr. Heitman declined the request due to the dog needing to be examined.

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION:

The Committee discussed that there is no period of time defined in the Veterinary Practice Act that a veterinarian has to see an animal to ensure the VPCR is still in effect. However, this premise had a policy and would not fill the prescription refill until the animal was seen. Additionally, Complainant severed the relationship by having her medical records transferred to another premise.

COMMITTEE'S PROPOSED CONCLUSIONS of LAW:

The Committee concluded that no violations of the Veterinary Practice Act occurred.

COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDED DISPOSITION:

Motion: It was moved and seconded the Board:

Dismiss this issue with no violation.

Vote: The motion was approved with a vote of 3 to 0.

The information contained in this report was obtained from the case file, which includes the complaint the respondent's response, any consulting veterinarian or witness input, and any other sources used to gather information for the investigation.

Tracy A. Riendeau, CVT Investigative Division